

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTERVIEW**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview on January 11, 2005.

### **II. OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION**

The specification was objected to because of three informalities. The specification has been amended accordingly. The description of EPDM has been clarified according to the Examiner's suggestion and the formulations at page 6 and page 7 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

### **III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 5-10 were objected to on the grounds that referring to a weight ratio, instead of an equivalent weight, was believed to be improper. This objection was discussed with the Examiner by telephone on January 11, 2005 and it was agreed that the current language in the pending claims is acceptable.

### **IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Tannenbaum (U.S. Pat. No. 5,240,775) and by Huesmann (U.S. Pat. No. 6,403,213). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Tannenbaum or Huesmann in view of Bahadur. Claims 5-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Tannenbaum or Huesmann individually.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the cited reference render the pending claims unpatentable. In view of the noted patentability of claims 4 and 11-15, however, claims 1-3 and 5-10 have been cancelled in order to expedite allowance of those claims. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claims 1-3 and 5-10 in another application.

## **V. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claims 4 and 11-15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 4 and 11-15 have been cancelled and rewritten as new claims 51-56, respectively. New claims 51-56 incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims for original claims 4 and 11-15.


## **VI. NEW CLAIMS 61-67**

New Claims 61-67 require a cross-linking agent for cross-linking the acrylic polymer with the alcohol. The cited references do not disclose a cross-linking agent for cross-linking the acrylic polymer with the alcohol.

## **VII. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark H. Remus  
Registration No. 40,141

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

January 20, 2005